

Lord Russell of Killowen.

published *The Life of Lord R*

[illegible]

fruit of great reading. His talent, however, saved him from expiating at the great length upon the commonplace. He made his points with clearness, and drew them home with force. He was a violent foe to any man. His biography consisted of a great story to be not read, except on occasion; he was hardly an accepted speaker. In the early days of his career a article did not come to him at all, and he had to take great pains to attract the attention of Society by personal intimacy. When at this time he knew and felt someone that, without these social intimacies, he could not succeed, he was not inclined to respond to society. In truth, he was more than a great orator; he was a great personality. If not a great orator, he had at all events the tactician of a man, could advance. "We know the people to come, he selected every turn of the party, he could see at a glance what was feeling with them, nothing seemed him, every accident, everything was planned. He was the man who was sure how to use to the best advantage." In a word he had the *fin* of some of the advocates. This result of his vigilance and propensity was that Russell's "dances" had to concentrate his attention on his own leader, instead of on the leader or the other side. In the case of the "reformers" or "statesmen" who were there, it pleased out in consultation. But Russell was in the presence of an enemy and in the twinkling of an eye changed the whole line of battle. For this reason the biography thinks that Russell would have made a great General. Indeed, some

It is clear that Hummel's relations with solitaires were peculiar. Most members of the English lay are public, if not generous to the last who maintain the tradition. Hummel was not public to any solitaires except one. Hummel was always independent and a free man of the day, but he never allowed solitaires to influence him. "The way he treated solitaires was not warm, respectful," says one who was well informed, adding, "On the northern coast it was customary to use very strong language." A solitaire who told Hummel "I might as well be a dead dog" would not be well received. He would have been considered popular among solitaires. He was apt to blame them if a paper was not forthcoming instantly, or if evidence were wanting at a moment's notice, and he often thoughtlessly expressed his dissatisfaction.

to sit in the place of Russell's successor with political influence in the Parliament that was dissolved in 1896 the borough of Dunblane was represented by Sir James Bryce, a Catholic Tory. At the general election of 1900, however, the Liberal candidate failed to appear in the field. Mr. Callan, who appeared in the field, in the triangular third Bryce was left at the bottom of the poll and Mr. Callan got in, beating Russell by 11 votes. Thus the Liberal cause was again represented in a borough which was returned again and again until his efforts were crowned with success. At the general election of 1924 the Liberal candidate again asked Russell to stand for Dunblane, and he again refused, saying that he was not that he was a Catholic he might not succeed, and the seat was given to Mr. Hornehill. Russell, however, did again stand as a Liberal for Dunblane, but he was once more defeated by Mr. Callan, who now came

At the general election of 1885 Russell was unable to stand for Dundalk because that borough had been disfranchised by the Reform act of 1884. He now sought a constituency in England, and decided to stand for Hackney. He was not yet a Home Ruler, and still owing to his original opinion that the Home Rule Bill was premature, though less so, very earnest. But he doubted if it were necessary, and he held that for conditions were essential to bring it within the range of practical politics. These conditions were that a workable scheme should be produced, that it should be presented by a practically united people on the part of Ireland, that the English mind should be educated, and that the demand should be made in a Christian and a civilised way. He was the counter to Home Rule at the end of 1885 that he had been hitherto, though some of the conditions named had yet been complied with. In his Hackney address in November 1885, he said "I am extremely opposed to separation, but answering imperial control in all imperial questions. I think Ireland on Irish soil should have the power of deciding in the way that she thinks best. I will speak of no other matters than this. I am generally opposed to Mr. Isaac M. Austin's harping, and an attempt was made to create a proposition against him on account of his religion. The effort failed, and he got in by a decisive majority."

It will be remembered that the general election of 1885 was a bitter contest of the Liberals and the Conservatives. The Liberals and fifty to a hundred and 200 Tories were returned, but among the Liberals had a majority of 80. The Irish Nationalists, however, numbered eighty or more. It followed that even if Russell should support the Conservatives, the latter would only be in the minority, while on the other hand his strong support would support the Liberal Government. It was now evident that he intended to make terms with the Irish leader and it was known that the latter would accept nothing short of a Dublin Parliament. Early in January, 1886, Russell and his present biographer talked over the situation. The question was how many Liberals Gladstone could get to se-

Pigott then told the jury a broken man, the morning after the trial, had appeared, and that the letters were his. He could not stand up to his man, and with every law Russell now bent him to the ropes. On Friday, Feb. 22, the court adjourned until Tuesday the 26th. On that morning Pigott was again called, but there was no answer. It turned out that he had not been seen since the 22d. On the 27th, the previous evening, Russell asked the clerk to issue a writ to issue a warrant for Pigott's apprehension; but it was decided that no steps should be taken until next day. Next day the Attorney-General informed the Court that a document in Pigott's handwriting had been received from Paris. A second subpoena was issued, and the Court adjourned until the 28th. It contained a confession of guilt taken down by Mr. Lalaurie in the presence of George Augustus Sigs, and signed by Pigott, on Saturday Feb. 22, at Mr. Lalaurie's house. A passage from the confession is reproduced in the last column.

The circumstances connected with the obtaining of the letter, as I gave in evidence, are not true. No one ever myself was concerned in the transaction. I told Mr. Houston that I had discovered the letter in Paris, but I give no facts to confirm that I simply discovered them. I gave no names of Mr. Pigott, Mr. Sigs, and myself, and expunged certain words, phrases, and general character of the handwriting. I traced some words and phrases by putting the genuine letters against the window, and finding the same in a window of one office. These genuine letters were the letters from Mr. Sigs, copies of which have been read in court, and four of the letters from Mr. Sigs, which were also read in court. I destroyed these letters after using. Some of the signatures I traced in this manner, and some I wrote. I then wrote to Mr.

[illegible]

Called "The
It Is
From
emity
Mr. L
writes
—We
Numer
by this c
weeks, re
appeals t
should be
T. Finck
of Dec. 2
in Mind."
as the a
sex from
author's
so often c
offers no
researche
duce his
and "Rom
seem to
morbid o
It is ve
woman f
an oppon
without h
feels as if
in the fa
women fo
a plane
from son
have hop
a time w
of intell
for the v
meet the
comrade
working o
selves, o
the race
a certain
it so, and
may tur
shut and
staring b
her sex,
the badge
and whe
surmount
some ma
let letter
Mr. Fin
this fav
what the
woman o
physical
tractive
man wis
self. T
sideratio
"sex in
tence: "V
holding
unwoma
the sorb
will in u
still in a
—that is
In one
of burde
any exp
but beca
loal bea
sphere."
Writer in
educatio
political
them. T
they do
look pre
express
if they
should
"refined
to rende
husband
If me
the rou
themsel
They ne
but it d
protest
it. How
the two
beautiful
"clamor
face wit
is that
honest h
be allow
When
against
freedom
Mr. Fin
of Bras
of Afric
we may
the arg
when, h
very fa
woman
cally a
"prove
that the
ther co
I in, h
to ane
out us
give hi
the "u
There
mevw
Andrew
He has
Clemm
clever c
ambling
son's p
or a c
Lang
cause o
minded
to vent
him int
no," th
paled
hood
mouth
val wi
For
invent
expect
very a
his an
civilize
the pr
this c
not ha
for th
They c
for th
in the
a jaco
woman
election
list, a
whom
line m
and
Let me
speak
It is
the an
a const
dared
entire
speak
to be
that "I
sation
sundae
a
to
to
the w
are m
woman
sation
plains
Woe
speak
how c
satisf
their
speak
speak
speak
The
The